REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 5, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-15, 18, 19, and 21-23 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 24 and 25 have been newly added. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12-16 and 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Araujo et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0047406), hereinafter Araujo. The Office Action took the position that Araujo teaches all of the subject matter of the pending claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2 and 4-7 are dependent, recites a method that includes receiving a request from a client device for access to an application associated with a network device. The method also includes establishing a session between a unified session manager and a management server associated with the application. The establishing the session with the management server further includes authenticating the unified session manager to the management server. The authentication is virtually transparent to the client device. The method also includes modifying the request at the unified session manager. The method also includes forwarding, by the unified session manager, the modified request to the management server. The also includes receiving a

response at the unified session manager from the management server. The method also includes modifying the response at the unified session manager, and forwarding, by the unified session manager, the modified response to the client device.

Claim 8, upon which claims 9-14 are dependent, recites an apparatus that includes a transceiver configured to receive a request from a client for access to an application on the network device and to forward a response to the request. The apparatus also includes a processor, coupled to the transceiver, that is configured to establish a session on behalf of the client between the unified session manager and a management server associated with the application. The session is established with the management server by the processor which is further configured to authenticate the unified session manager to the management server. The authentication is virtually transparent to the client device. The processor is also configured to modify the request, forward the modified request to the management server, and receive the response on behalf of the client from the management server associated with the application. The processor is also configured to modify the response, and forward the modified response from the management server to the transceiver.

Claim 15, upon which claims 16-18 are dependent, recites a method that includes establishing a session between a unified session manager and at least one of a plurality of the management servers. The unified session manager is enabled to operate on behalf of at least one of a plurality of clients. The establishing the session with the at least one of the management servers further includes authenticating the unified session manager to

the management server. The authentication is virtually transparent to the clients. The method also includes modifying each message from the at least one of the plurality of clients destined for an application associated with the at least one of the plurality of the managements servers. The modification is virtually transparent to the client and to the management server.

Claim 19, upon which claims 20-22 are dependent, recites a method that includes retrieving a set of menu entries including at least one menu entry that is associated with a remote application. The method also includes displaying a selection menu on a display comprising the set of menu entries. The method also includes retrieving a menu entry selection signal. The menu entry selection signal is modified by a unified session manager. The method also includes forwarding the modifying menu entry selection signal to a management server associated with the remote application. The method also includes receiving another signal indicative of a response from the management server. The other signal is modified by the unified session manager. The method also includes establishing a session between the unified session manager and the management server associated with the application. The establishing the session with the management server further includes authenticating the unified session manager to the management server, wherein the authentication is virtually transparent to a client device. The method also includes displaying the other modified signal at the display.

Claim 23 discloses an apparatus that includes a means for establishing a session with a management server associated with an application on behalf of a remote client.

The establishing the session with the management server further includes authenticating means for authenticating the unified session manager to the management server. The authenticating means is virtually transparent to the client. The apparatus also includes means of modifying a request. The apparatus also includes a first forwarding component configured to forward the modified request to the management server, and a means for receiving a response from the management server. The apparatus also includes a means for modifying the response, and a second forwarding component configured to forward the modified response to the remote client.

As will be discussed below, the teachings of Araujo fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims, and therefore fails to provide the features discussed above. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Initially, Applicant notes that the Office Action admitted that Araujo does not explicitly teach all of the subject matter of claim 3 (now cancelled and its subject matter incorporated into independent claims 1, 8, 15, 19 and 23-25) (see page 16 of the Office Action). The Office Action took the position that these admitted deficiencies of Araujo (i.e., "establishing the session with the management server further comprises authenticating the unified session manager to the management server, wherein the authentication is virtually transparent to the client device", as recited, in part, in independent claim 1 and similarly in independent claims 8, 15, 18 and 23-25) are rendered obvious because paragraph [0109] of Araujo discloses using SSL to protect the transferred information of the virtual office, and that the SEP and application servers use

SSL and "using SSL is known to inherently include an authentication step" and that this is "transparent to the client device since the client device has no participation in it." Applicant respectfully disagrees that Araujo discloses all of the subject matter of the claims or renders them obvious for at least the following reasons.

The present application discloses a method and system for managing multiple management servers using a unified session manager (see pages 8-12 of the specification). The unified session manager (208) may authenticate a user requesting access to an application of a network appliance 214. The unified session manager 208 may establish a session with a management server 210 associated with the component application based in part on a request for access. The unified session manager 208 translates graphical user interface messages, network addresses, and other information between the user and the management server 210 during the session between the user and the network appliance 214. The configurations of the present application provide the user with a uniform interface with a plurality of management servers associated with the network appliance 214 (see 210 and 310 of respective FIGS. 2 and 3 of the present application).

In one example of the present application, the unified session manager 308 may provide the user direct access to one or more component applications 312 if the application is directly managed by the unified session manager 308. The unified session manager 308 may or may not reside on the network device. Furthermore, the unified session manager 308 is able to authenticate the user. Authentication may include

verification of login password, a digital signature, recognition of the user's own address etc. Although, an application on the network device may be directly managed by the unified session manager 308, another application in the network device may be managed by a separate management server (see page 5 and page 10 of the present application).

The unified session manager (208/208) of the present application is different from the SEP in Araujo in that the unified session manager (208/308) is capable of modifying a request and does not need to be part of the network device. In addition, the unified session manager (208/308) can also perform <u>authentication</u> of the user and directly manage the network device, and in certain circumstances, it may permit for an application on the network device to be managed by a separate management server.

Araujo does not disclose a unified session manager that performs any of these features discussed above. Araujo certainly does not disclose or suggest "establishing a session between a unified session manager and a management server associated with the application, wherein establishing the session with the management server further comprises authenticating the unified session manager to the management server, wherein the authentication is virtually transparent to the client device", as recited, in part, in independent claim 1 and similarly in independent claims 8, 15, 19 and 23-25. The Office Action admitted that Araujo does not disclose the above-noted features of the claims. In addition, in view of the above differences between the unified session manager of the present application and the SEP of Araujo, the operation of the SEP does not render

obvious those features missing from the claims which are admittedly not taught by Araujo.

The subject matter recited in independent claim 1 and similarly in independent claims 8, 15, 19 and 23-25 recites that a session is established between the unified session manager and the management server and that the authentication is transparent to the user. The Office Action's alleged attempt to justify such an established connection transparent to the user is without merit. There is no indication included in the teachings of Araujo that the connection establishment may be transparent to the client. In addition, there is no correlation between the SEP and the unified session manager because the SEP 200 is part of the virtual office server itself and the unified session manager is separate from a management server. The configuration offered by Araujo is clearly different from those illustrated in FIGS. 2 and 3 of the present application, where the unified session manager and the management server are separate devices. The single device configuration of the virtual office server 30 of Araujo could not possibly produce the outcome of the claimed subject matter which provides transparent authentication between a unified session manager and a management server.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Araujo fails to teach all of the subject matter of independent claims 1, 8, 15, 19 and 23-25. By virtue of dependency, Araujo also fails to teach the subject matter of those claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12-16 and 18-23 is kindly requested.

Claims 3, 10, 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Araujo. As stated above, Araujo does not teach all of the subject matter of any of independent claims 1, 8, 15, 19 and 23-25 because Araujo does not disclose or suggest "establishing a session between a unified session manager and a management server associated with the application, wherein establishing the session with the management server further comprises authenticating the unified session manager to the management server, wherein the authentication is virtually transparent to the client device", as recited, in part, in independent claim 1 and similarly in independent claims 8, 15, 19 and 23-25. Therefore, because Araujo does not teach or suggest all of the features of the above-noted claims, Araujo also does not teach or render obvious the subject matter of any of dependent claims 10, 11 and 17. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10, 11 and 17 is kindly requested.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1, 2 and 4-25 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

Kamran Emdadi
Registration No. 58,823

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

KE:sjm

Enclosures: Additional Claims Fee Transmittal